EN 9100:2018 Quality management systems for aviation, space and defence

Quality management in aviation and space

93 requirements. This standard can be certified against by an accredited body. As of 07/2026.

This list stands on its own. EN 9100 already contains the requirements of ISO 9001 in full, and the supplementary requirements for aviation, space and defence are marked here. So no second list is needed alongside it. EN 9100, AS9100 and JISQ 9100 are identical in content. What gets certified is the organisation for a defined site, and the certificate only counts if it is entered in the IAQG database OASIS. Self-assessment without any examining character, no proof for a certification.

Company	Date	Prepared by

4 Context of the Organization and Structure of the Management System 6

4.1 **The external and internal issues that affect the ability to reliably deliver airworthy products and services are identified and reviewed at defined intervals. These include, among others, requirements set by aviation authorities and customers, dependencies within the supply chain, developments in technology and materials, the availability of qualified personnel, and the organization's own standing in terms of equipment and competence.**

What proves it: A short context overview carrying a date and a responsible person, for example a table with the columns issue, external or internal, effect on the management system, last review. Alongside it, the management review minutes in which the update is recorded. A small operation keeps this as a one page document and updates it once a year in the same meeting as the management review.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.2 **The parties relevant to the management system are determined, together with their expectations regarding the product and the system. Those captured include at least customers and end users of the aviation chain, the responsible oversight and airworthiness authorities, certification bodies, external providers, and the organization's own employees. Information on these parties and their requirements is monitored and kept current.**

What proves it: A list of the parties with one line each for the requirement, its source (contract, customer specification, regulatory requirement, statute, standard) and the date of the last review. The supporting evidence is the contract documentation, customer specifications and authority correspondence themselves. In a small operation a table of ten to fifteen lines is enough, updated whenever a new customer requirement or a contract change arrives.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.3 **The scope of the management system is available as documented information. It names the sites, products, services and processes covered and thereby draws a clear boundary. Clauses of the standard judged not applicable are listed individually and justified, and none of these exclusions affects product conformity or the fulfilment of customer requirements. Customer and regulatory requirements are taken into account when the scope is set.** Document

What proves it: The scope as a controlled document of its own or as a clearly delimited section of the system description, giving site addresses, product lines, manufacturing and inspection methods, together with a list of the excluded clauses and the reasoning behind each. For a small supplier two paragraphs suffice, provided they state unambiguously which methods and which site are covered and which activities are deliberately left out.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.4 **The processes needed for the management system are determined and their interactions are shown. Processes placed with external providers or transferred to other sites of the company expressly remain part of the system and are identified as such, including the way in which they are controlled.**

What proves it: A process map or flow overview showing management, core and support processes and making the handovers between them visible. Alongside it, a list of all outsourced processes (for example heat treatment, non destructive testing, surface treatment, calibration) stating how each one is controlled. An operation with few employees manages with a single page on which six to eight processes are connected by arrows.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.4.1 **For each process the inputs and the expected outputs are defined, as are the sequence within the flow, the resources needed, the person responsible, and the criteria and indicators by which effective control can be recognized. The risks and opportunities associated with the process have been considered, and the processes are improved on the basis of the values collected.**

What proves it: A one page process profile for each process: purpose, input, output, responsible person, one or two indicators with a target value, resources needed, risks identified. Alongside it, the values actually measured, for example on time delivery, defect rate, scrap, complaints per period, together with the actions derived from them. What matters is not the number of indicators but that the measured values demonstrably feed into decisions.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

4.4.2 **The documents needed to carry out the processes are available and controlled, and records are kept that show the processes run as defined. A coherent system description brings together the scope, the processes and their interactions and refers to the associated procedures.** Document

What proves it: A system description or manual with a reference list pointing to procedures and work instructions, plus a document register showing revision status, approval and validity. Evidence that the flow is actually lived comes from the running records themselves, such as job travelers, inspection records and release notes. A small operation meets this with a manual of a few pages that is, at its core, an ordered reference list.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5 Leadership: top management responsibility, policy and roles 7

5.1.1-a **Top management personally stands behind the effectiveness of the quality management system: it has established the quality policy and the quality objectives, these fit the strategic direction of the organization, and the requirements of the system are built into everyday business processes rather than running as a separate paper trail.**

What proves it: Approved quality policy carrying a date and a signature from management, an objectives sheet with measures, minutes of the management review that link back to the business strategy. In a small organization a one page objectives sheet plus the minutes of the annual management round, in which the owner names and signs off the objectives personally, is enough.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.1.1-b **Top management provides the resources that are needed, makes the importance of effective quality management clear inside the organization, supports staff in contributing to that effectiveness, and promotes process thinking, risk based thinking and continual improvement.**

What proves it: Budget and resource approvals for quality topics, notices or short messages from management, attendance lists from quality meetings, improvement suggestions together with the feedback given. Small organizations show this through brief notes from the weekly round that record the quality topics, the people responsible and the due dates.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.1.2 **Top management makes sure that customer requirements and the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements are determined, understood and consistently met, that risks and opportunities affecting product conformity are considered, and that product conformity and on time delivery performance are kept in view and backed with actions whenever they fall short.**

What proves it: A measures sheet showing on time delivery and complaint rate per customer, an evaluation of customer complaints, an action list for missed target values, evidence that customer and regulatory requirements are reviewed at order entry. A small organization keeps this as one monthly table with the promised and the actual delivery date plus a column for the cause of any delay.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.2.1 **A quality policy exists that suits the purpose and the context of the organization, provides a framework for setting quality objectives, and explicitly contains the commitment to satisfy applicable requirements and to continually improve the management system.**

What proves it: The current version of the quality policy with its revision status and release date, together with the way the ongoing quality objectives are derived from its statements. It becomes auditable once at least one measurable objective or one measure can be named for every statement in the policy.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.2.2 **The quality policy is available as documented information, is communicated to all staff and understood by them, is applied in practice, and is made available to relevant interested parties in a suitable form.** Document

What proves it: Distribution record or acknowledgement by the workforce, a notice at the site or an entry in the controlled document system, publication for customers and suppliers, for example on the website or in the supplier portal. In a small organization a signed notice sheet plus filing the policy in the controlled document folder is enough.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.3-a **Responsibilities and authorities for the quality relevant tasks are assigned and known within the organization: who ensures conformity with the requirements of the standard, who is responsible for process performance and for reporting to top management, who promotes customer focus, and who approves changes to the management system.**

What proves it: An organization chart naming individuals, job or function descriptions stating authorities, a deputy arrangement, an approval matrix for system changes. A small organization maps this as a one page role matrix where each row is a task and each column is a person.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

5.3-b **A member of management is explicitly entrusted with the responsibility and the authority for the quality management system, has unrestricted access to top management irrespective of other duties, and has the freedom to resolve matters of product conformity and system nonconformity without detours.**

What proves it: A written appointment with a date, a signature from management and a description of the authorities, plus minutes that show the direct reporting line to management. In small organizations the owner often takes on this role, which is stated that way in the appointment so that access to top management stays traceable.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6 Planning: risks and opportunities, quality objectives, planned changes 7

6.1.1-a **The organisation has derived, from its operating context and from the expectations of its relevant interested parties, which risks and which opportunities bear on quality management; the analysis is visibly aimed at achieving the intended results, at preventing or reducing undesired effects, and at driving improvement.**

What proves it: A risk and opportunity register in which each entry states its origin (a finding from the context analysis, an expectation of a customer, an authority or a supplier) together with an assessment of likelihood and impact. Minutes of the session in which the register was compiled, plus a note of when it was last reviewed, work well. A small business gets by with a single table that is walked through once a quarter in the operations meeting and signed off with a date.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2-a **Actions are planned for the identified risks and opportunities and are built into the quality management processes, that is, anchored where the work actually happens rather than maintained in a separate list alongside day to day business.**

What proves it: An action plan with owner, due date and status, together with evidence of the anchoring: the revised procedure or work instruction, the extended inspection instruction, the amended release rule, a new item in a checklist or in the supplier evaluation. Small businesses simply reference, in the action line, the document that the action changed.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.1.2-b **The effort spent on an action bears a traceable relationship to the potential impact on the conformity of products and services and on customer satisfaction, and after implementation the organisation evaluates whether the action actually reduced the risk or captured the opportunity.**

What proves it: An effectiveness review for each action, stating the criterion against which the effect was measured, for example defect rate, on time delivery or number of complaints before and after implementation, together with the re-rating of the risk once the action is closed. For a small business a single effectiveness column with date, figure and a short remark on whether the action stays, is tightened or is dropped is enough.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.1-a **Documented quality objectives exist for the functions, levels and processes that matter for quality; they are stated in measurable or otherwise verifiable terms, are consistent with the quality policy, take account of applicable customer and regulatory requirements, and are visibly related to the conformity of the output and to customer satisfaction.** Document

What proves it: An objectives sheet or metrics overview giving target value, reference base, period and owner for each objective, plus the derivation from the quality policy and from specific customer or regulatory requirements. In aviation, on time delivery and complaint rate are typical customer objectives set in the contract or in the supplier portal. Small businesses keep a single board with a handful of objectives, but every one of them carries a figure, a due date and a name.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.1-b **The quality objectives are known to the workforce, their progress is monitored, and the objectives are updated when needed, for example when an objective has been met, when customer requirements change, or when the operating conditions of the business shift.**

What proves it: A notice board posting, meeting minutes or a short briefing record showing that the objectives were communicated, plus a history of actual values such as monthly figures, a chart or a tracking list, and the decision to update with date and rationale. A small business captures both in a short monthly record in which the objective line carries the current value.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.2.2-a **For every quality objective it is planned what will actually be done, what resources are available for it, who is responsible, by when it is to be completed, and how achievement of the objective will be evaluated.**

What proves it: An implementation plan per objective carrying the five items action, resources, owner, due date and evaluation criterion, for example as columns of the objectives table or as a short objectives sheet. Evaluation criterion means the value at which the objective counts as met, for example scrap rate <= 1 percent or on time delivery >= 98 percent. Small businesses simply extend their existing objectives table with these columns instead of opening a second document.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

6.3-a **Changes to the quality management system are planned rather than made in passing; before implementation the purpose and the potential consequences of the change have been considered, the continued integrity of the system as a whole is assured, the necessary resources are available, and responsibilities and authorities are assigned or reassigned.**

What proves it: A change note or change request stating the trigger, the intended effect, the processes and documents affected, the resources needed, the owner and the release, together with evidence of implementation, for example the new revision status of the amended instruction and the briefing of the people affected. Typical triggers are a new process, a move to another site, a change in management or a switch of software. Small businesses keep a one page change log in which every system change is listed with date, reason, documents affected and release.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7 Support: Resources, Competence, Awareness, Communication and Documented Information 18

7.1.1 **The resources needed to establish, operate and continually improve the quality management system have been determined and are available, with a conscious trade-off between the capability held in house and the capability that has to be obtained from external providers.**

What proves it: Resource plan covering people, machines, measuring equipment and software, an investment or budget list for the current year, and make-or-buy decisions for externally provided processes such as heat treatment, calibration or non-destructive testing. A small organisation captures this as a single table showing, for each process step, whether it runs in house or is bought in and what capacity sits behind it.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.2 **The number of people and the skills they need for effective implementation of the management system and for control of the processes have been determined, and those people are genuinely available, including when someone is absent or order volumes peak.**

What proves it: Staffing plan per area, skills matrix with a deputy arrangement, and evidence of cover for key tasks such as final inspection or release. In a small organisation a person versus task matrix is enough, provided every critical task is mastered by at least two people.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.3 **Buildings, utilities, machines, transport equipment and information and communication technology are specified and maintained so that products and services meet the agreed requirements.**

What proves it: Maintenance plan with intervals and completed maintenance per machine, breakdown and repair history, evidence of data backup and of the availability of the software in use. A small organisation keeps one sheet per machine with maintenance dates and a signature, which is sufficient as evidence.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.4 **The conditions under which the processes run have been defined and are maintained where they affect product conformity. This covers physical factors such as temperature, cleanliness, electrostatic discharge control, lighting and noise, as well as human factors such as workload and fatigue during visual and inspection tasks.**

What proves it: Defined limits per area, records of environmental, cleanliness or ESD monitoring, test records for ESD workstations, and a rule for breaks and maximum duration of visual inspection. Small organisations evidence this with a simple measurement record and a short statement of the acceptable range and of who intervenes when it is exceeded.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.5.1 **Where results are measured or monitored to demonstrate conformity, the resources used are suitable for the specific measurement task, that suitability is maintained, and evidence of it is retained.** Document

What proves it: Assignment of each measurement task to a measuring device stating the required tolerance and the resolution of the device, a suitability assessment or measurement system analysis for critical characteristics, and release of the device for use. A small organisation documents, for each inspection characteristic, which device is used and why its resolution is adequate in relation to the tolerance, as a rule of thumb resolution <= one tenth of the tolerance.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.5.2-a **Monitoring and measuring equipment is calibrated or verified at defined intervals or before use against standards traceable to international or national measurement standards, and where no such standard exists, the basis used for calibration is recorded.** Document

What proves it: Calibration certificates stating the traceability of the laboratory, a calibration schedule with due dates, and for in-house references a written definition of the calibration basis. A small organisation sends callipers and micrometers to an accredited laboratory and files the certificates per device.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.5.2-b **A current register of all monitoring and measuring equipment exists which shows, for each device, the unique identification, the location, the calibration interval, the method used and the acceptance criteria, and from which the calibration status can be read at any time.** Document

What proves it: Equipment register as a list or database with inventory number, due date and status, plus an overview of overdue devices. A small organisation keeps this as a table with one row per device and a column for the next calibration date, reviewed monthly.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.5.2-c **Monitoring and measuring equipment is identified so that its calibration status is recognisable, it is safeguarded against unauthorised adjustment, damage and deterioration during handling, storage and transport, and software used for inspection is confirmed as capable before first use and after any change.**

What proves it: Calibration label or colour code on the device, secured settings and seals, storage rules for sensitive equipment, and a release record for inspection software and inspection programs including the version. A small organisation solves this with a label showing the next due date and a lockable cabinet for the reference equipment.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.5.2-d **When measuring equipment is found to be unfit for its purpose, the validity of the measurement results previously obtained with it is assessed. Affected product is identified, customers and, where required, authorities are notified, and the actions taken are recorded.**

What proves it: Record of the calibration finding with the deviation observed, a look-back assessment across all lots since the last valid calibration, the hold or recall decision, and the customer notification. A small organisation captures this as a short note in the calibration file naming the device, the deviation, the affected orders and the decision.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.1.6 **The knowledge the organisation needs for its processes and for product conformity has been determined, is kept available, and is deliberately extended when requirements change, so that it does not rest with single individuals.**

What proves it: Collection of internal experience such as setup parameters, manufacturing notes and lessons learned from complaints, controlled access to external sources such as standards, customer specifications and manufacturer data, and a succession and handover arrangement for key knowledge. A small organisation maintains a knowledge sheet per part family into which each finding is added after every problem.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-a **For every activity that affects quality performance the necessary competence has been determined, the people assigned actually possess it on the basis of education, training or experience, and evidence of that competence is retained, including for people who work at external providers on behalf of the organisation.** Document

What proves it: Requirement profile per activity, certificates, qualifications and valid process approvals for example for welding, soldering or non-destructive testing, and a skills matrix with expiry dates. Small organisations keep a matrix of person, activity, evidence and expiry date and review it quarterly for lapsed approvals.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.2-b **Where a competence gap exists, action has been taken, for example training, mentoring, reassignment or engaging a suitably qualified person, and the effectiveness of that action has been evaluated afterwards.**

What proves it: Training plan with target and actual state, attendance records, and effectiveness checks through practical release, a work sample, a four-eyes sign-off or an evaluation of the defect rate after training. A small organisation demonstrates effectiveness through a signed-off first work sample under supervision rather than through a test.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.3-a **Employees know the quality policy and the quality objectives relevant to them, they understand how their work contributes to the effectiveness of the management system, and they are aware of the consequences of not meeting the requirements of the system.**

What proves it: Briefing record with content and signature, the policy and the area objectives posted at the workplace, and a short check during the internal audit. A small organisation evidences this through the minutes of the annual workforce briefing with an attendance list.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.3-b **Employees are aware of their contribution to product conformity and to product safety and of the importance of ethical behaviour. This expressly includes the right to report deviations, damage and doubts about the authenticity of parts without suffering any disadvantage.**

What proves it: Briefing on product safety, foreign object prevention and counterfeit parts using examples from the organisation itself, a code of conduct with acknowledgement, and a reporting channel for concerns together with evidence that reports were acted upon. A small organisation covers this with a one page code of conduct signed by every person, naming a contact for confidential reports.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.4 **For internal and external communication about the management system it is defined what is communicated, when, with whom, by which channel and by whom, in particular regarding quality objectives, deviations, changes to products and processes, and feedback to customers and authorities.**

What proves it: Communication matrix with trigger, recipient, channel, deadline and owner, minutes of quality meetings, and evidence of customer notification in the event of deviations and of reporting to the responsible authority where required. Small organisations keep this as a single page with four columns and set out the escalation level for customer complaints in it.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.1 **The management system includes the documented information explicitly required by the standard as well as the documents and records the organisation itself considers necessary for the effectiveness of its processes, and the extent matches the size, activity and complexity of the organisation.** Document

What proves it: Register of valid documents mapped to the clauses of the standard, and an overview of record types with retention periods. A small organisation manages with a single list naming document title, version, owner and storage location.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.2 **When documented information is created and updated, unique identification with title, date and revision status, a suitable format and medium, and review and approval by an authorised person are ensured.**

What proves it: Document header with number, version, date, author and approver, a revision history stating the reason for the change, and an approval note or electronic approval in the system. A small organisation uses one fixed header template for all documents and enters every approval in a central version list.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

7.5.3 **Documented information is controlled: it is available where it is needed, it is protected against loss, unauthorised change and loss of confidentiality, obsolete versions are withdrawn from use, documents of external origin such as customer specifications and standards are identified as such and kept current, and retention periods are defined and met, including where records are held by an external provider.** Document

What proves it: Access and authorisation concept, data backup with a restore test, marking or withdrawal of invalid versions, a reference list of customer requirements and standards with revision status, a retention plan per record type stating location, period and treatment at the end of the period, and the corresponding obligation in the contract with external providers. A small organisation handles this with a one page retention plan and the rule that only the version on the network drive is valid and that paper printouts carry a print date and count as uncontrolled.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8 Operation: Planning, Customer Requirements and Design 39

8.1-a **The processes for delivering products and services are planned and controlled: product requirements are known, acceptance criteria for processes and products are defined, the necessary resources are assigned, and records exist showing that the processes ran as planned.** Document

What proves it: Production or order plan per job, routings with inspection points and acceptance criteria, capacity and resource planning, travellers or job cards signed and dated at each operation. A small shop gets by with one traveller per batch showing operation, operator, date and inspection result.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1-b **Planned changes to operational processes are reviewed and released before implementation; unplanned changes are reviewed afterwards and their consequences are contained. Outsourced processes and the transfer of work to another site or to an external provider are planned, controlled and monitored for their effect on the product.**

What proves it: Change requests with review and release, nonconformity notices for unplanned changes, transfer plan with qualification steps and first article evidence at the new location, list of outsourced processes with the matching controls. In a small shop a one page change form with reason, impact, release and effectiveness check is enough.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.1 **Operational processes are covered by an end to end approach to risk: responsibilities are assigned, risks are identified and assessed, actions are taken against defined acceptability criteria, and the effectiveness of those actions is tracked.** Aviation

What proves it: Risk register per order or product line with an assessment scale, actions, due date, owner and residual risk, plus minutes of the regular reviews. Small companies keep the register as a spreadsheet and walk through it at order launch and in the management review.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.2 **The valid state of a product can be identified unambiguously at any point in time: configuration data is defined, changes to it are traceable, and the delivered condition demonstrably matches the released state.** Aviation

What proves it: Bills of material and drawings with revision level, change history per revision, release stamp, comparison of as built condition against the required state before delivery. Without a dedicated system a maintained revision and release register with write protected folders per revision is sufficient.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.3 **Product safety across the whole life cycle is addressed in a planned way: safety relevant characteristics and failure consequences are assessed, matching measures in design and manufacturing are defined, and safety relevant occurrences are reported and evaluated.** Aviation

What proves it: Safety assessment or hazard analysis per product, marking of safety relevant characteristics on the drawing and in the routing, reporting route for field occurrences with evaluation. In a small shop a short analysis sheet per product family plus one fixed reporting address is enough.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.1.4 **Effective safeguards are in place against the use of counterfeit or untraceable parts: purchasing is preferably done from approved sources, evidence of origin is required and verified, personnel are made aware, and suspect parts are quarantined and reported.** Aviation

What proves it: List of approved sources, certificates with an unbroken supply chain for distributor material, incoming inspection including authenticity and plausibility checks, quarantine area with hold tags, training records. Small companies buy directly from the manufacturer or an authorised distributor and file the chain of origin in the receiving record.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2.1-a **Communication with the customer is defined and covers product information, enquiries and orders including their changes, as well as feedback and complaints.**

What proves it: Quotations and order confirmations, correspondence or a ticket system for enquiries and changes, complaint log with receipt, response and closure. In a small company a customer order folder holding the communication in chronological order is enough.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2.1-b **The handling of customer property is agreed with the customer, and contingency arrangements for disrupted delivery capability are agreed where this is required.**

What proves it: Identification and segregated storage of customer property including supplied drawings and data, notification in case of damage, contingency plan for delivery capability with alternative sources and restart times. Small companies keep the contingency plan to one page with contact person, alternative source and reporting deadline.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2.2 **Before committing to the customer, all product requirements are determined: what the customer states, what the intended use requires, what law and the aviation authority demand, and what the organisation itself promises. The organisation can demonstrate that it is able to meet these requirements.**

What proves it: Requirements list or specification per order, reference to the applicable airworthiness rules and certification basis, evidence of the organisation's own approvals and process releases, feasibility note before the quotation goes out. Small companies use a short feasibility checklist signed off by the person responsible for the quotation.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2.3.1 **Every order is reviewed before acceptance: customer requirements including delivery and post delivery activities, special requirements, critical items, operational risks as well as differing or unclear contract data are checked and clarified before commitment.**

What proves it: Order review with a tick per item and a signature, note on resolved differences between enquiry and quotation, identification of special requirements and critical items in the order file, reference to the related risk assessment. For verbal orders the organisation confirms the understood requirements to the customer in writing.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2.3.2 **The result of the order review and every requirement added during that review are recorded.** Document

What proves it: Signed off review form or release status in the order system, file note on requirements agreed afterwards, filing with the order documents including date and owner.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.2.4 **If product requirements change, the affected documents are corrected and all people and functions involved are informed of the change before work continues.**

What proves it: Change notice with distribution list and acknowledgement of receipt, updated order paperwork showing the new state, hold marking on superseded documents. In a small shop a short change note on the traveller, countersigned by production and inspection, is enough.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3.1 **For products whose design the organisation owns, a defined design and development process exists. If the design is fully specified by the customer, this exclusion is justified and evidenced in the scope.**

What proves it: Design procedure with phases and release points or, in case of exclusion, contract and drawing situation showing the customer's design authority, together with the justification stated in the scope of the management system.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3.2-a **Design and development are planned: phases, reviews, verification and validation steps, responsibilities and authorities, interfaces between the parties involved, required resources and the involvement of customer and user are defined. The required evidence of meeting the objectives is determined and retained.** Document

What proves it: Development plan per project with phase plan, dates, roles and a list of required evidence, contact matrix for the interfaces, filing of the phase results. Small companies keep the plan to two pages with a milestone table and assigned responsibilities.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3.2-b **The development plan takes account of technical maturity, producibility, testability and maintainability as well as the risks arising from them. It is updated when scope, dates or resources change, and progress is checked at milestones against release criteria defined in advance.**

What proves it: Updated plan revisions with a change note, milestone minutes with a criteria list and the decision to proceed, development risk entries with actions. In a small shop a milestone record with three columns is enough: criterion, met, action.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3.3 **The design inputs are complete and unambiguous: function and performance, statutory and regulatory requirements, applicable standards and airworthiness rules, experience from previous similar developments and the possible consequences of failure are captured. Conflicting inputs are resolved, and the inputs are retained.** Document

What proves it: Requirements list with the source given per line, register of standards and rules with issue status, evaluation of defects and complaints from predecessor products, note on resolved conflicts with date and decision maker.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3.4 **Design and development are controlled: at defined points it is assessed whether the results meet the inputs, whether the result is fit for the intended use and which problems remain open. Identified problems are tracked to closure with an owner and a due date, and the results of these activities are retained.** Document

What proves it: Review minutes with participants, decisions and an action list, verification evidence such as calculation, simulation or comparison with a proven design, validation evidence from use under the intended conditions, action tracking through to closure.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3.4.1 **Where verification and validation are demonstrated by testing, the tests are planned and documented in advance: test plan with test methods and acceptance criteria, a test article whose configuration and manufacturing conditions represent the later production state, and suitable, monitored test equipment including test software. Execution follows the plan, results are recorded in full and assessed against the acceptance criteria.** Document Aviation

What proves it: Test plan and test instruction per item of evidence, configuration record of the test article with revision level and the production means used, calibration and release evidence for the test equipment and the test software applied, test report with raw data, deviations and assessment, release stamp. Small companies buy testing from an accredited laboratory and file the purchase order, test plan and report together.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3.5 **The design outputs meet the inputs and are sufficient for the following steps: they state acceptance criteria for manufacturing and inspection, identify critical items and safety relevant characteristics, and contain the data for provisioning, preservation, maintenance and spare parts. The outputs are retained.** Document

What proves it: Released set of drawings and bills of material, inspection specification with tolerances and acceptance criteria, marking of critical items on the drawing and in the inspection plan, operating and maintenance documents, spare parts list, release stamp with date and person.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.3.6 **Changes during and after design and development are identified, reviewed and controlled before they take effect. The impact on products already manufactured or delivered is assessed, the necessary approvals by customer or authority are in place, and the change, its review, its release and the actions taken are retained.** Document

What proves it: Change request with a technical and commercial assessment, effectivity date and first application, evidence of customer or authority approval where required, impact assessment for stock and fielded units with a decision on recall, retrofit or continued use, updated drawing revisions.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.4.1 **For purchased products, parts and services that are built into your own product or shipped straight to the customer, you have defined what level of control is needed. Documented criteria exist for selecting, approving, monitoring and re-evaluating external providers, and the results of those evaluations are retained as documented information.** Document

What proves it: Supplier evaluation procedure showing the criteria applied, completed evaluation sheets or a supplier list carrying approval status and date, records of the actions triggered by poor performance. A small shop can do this in a single spreadsheet: per supplier the approval status, approval date, on-time delivery, quality incidents, next re-evaluation.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.4.1.1 **Responsibility for the conformity of every purchased item stays with the organization, even where the customer directs the source. A register of approved providers is maintained showing the scope and the limits of each approval, provider performance is tracked, deviations are escalated, and customer-directed or authority-approved sources are honoured.** Document Aviation

What proves it: Approved provider register with scope of approval, hold notes and dates, a performance sheet per provider, escalation letters or corrective action requests with follow-up, evidence in the purchase order that the customer-directed source was used. Without an ERP system a well-kept spreadsheet plus filed provider correspondence is enough.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.4.2-a **The type and extent of control over an external provider follows the effect the purchased item has on product safety, conformity and customer requirements. Outsourced processes stay inside your own management system, and placing the order does not transfer responsibility to the provider.**

What proves it: Risk classification of parts or commodity groups with the resulting control method derived from it, for example first article release, one hundred percent inspection, sampling or review of certificates. For outsourced processes such as heat treatment or surface treatment, evidence that they appear on your own process map.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.4.2-b **Verification activities are defined that confirm the conformity of a delivery before it is used, for example receiving inspection, review of certificates and test reports, or audits at the provider. Sub-tier sourcing is controlled, and requirements are flowed down through the supply chain.**

What proves it: Receiving inspection instruction with inspection extent per risk class, inspection records showing batch and inspector, mill certificates and declarations of conformity in the order file, audit reports or provider confirmations that requirements were flowed down to their sub-tier suppliers.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.4.3 **Purchasing documents state in full what the provider has to deliver and comply with: the product and the process, the specifications and revision levels that apply, requirements for approval of product, methods and equipment, personnel qualification, notification of nonconformities and of changes, record retention, and the right of access to premises and documents for the organization, the customer and the authority. The information is reviewed for adequacy before the order is released.**

What proves it: A sample purchase order carrying all mandatory statements, a quality assurance agreement or frame contract referenced as an applicable document, a release note showing a second person checked the order. A small shop keeps a fixed text block in the order form and ticks the points off before sending.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1-a **Production and service provision run under controlled conditions. That means documented information on the required characteristics and the results to be achieved is available, suitable monitoring and measuring resources are on hand, monitoring and inspection take place at defined stages, infrastructure and environment are suitable, personnel are competent and where needed specifically authorized, and actions to prevent human error are in place.** Document

What proves it: Work and inspection plans listing characteristics, tolerances and inspection stages, competence records and authorizations of personnel, inspection records at the defined stages, a description of the error prevention used such as fixtures, second-person checks or checklists at critical points.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1-b **The valid manufacturing and inspection documents are present at the workstation at the current revision level, critical items and key characteristics are clearly identified in them and are monitored. Foreign object damage is prevented systematically, utilities and supply media such as compressed air, water or shielding gas are monitored, and equipment is maintained to a plan.**

What proves it: Router or traveller card with operation sequence, revision level and drawing, identification of key characteristics in the drawing and the inspection plan together with the recorded measured values, cleanliness and foreign object rules for the areas concerned with evidence of the checks, maintenance plan and maintenance history of the machines, test reports for the media.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1.1 **Equipment, fixtures, tooling and inspection software used to confirm product conformity are validated before first use and are re-verified afterwards at defined intervals. Storage, maintenance, revision level and condition are governed by rules, and any change to the software triggers a fresh confirmation.** Document Aviation

What proves it: Register of the fixtures, gauges and inspection programs in use with their version level, validation and periodic re-verification reports with date and result, release note after a software change, storage and maintenance rules. A small shop keeps one tool card per fixture showing initial release, periodic checks and any hold note.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1.2 **Processes whose output cannot be fully verified by later monitoring or measurement, for example welding, bonding, heat treatment, surface treatment or non-destructive testing, are qualified in advance. Qualification covers the method, the equipment and the personnel carrying it out, the defined parameters are held and recorded, and requalification follows any change or expiry of validity.** Document Aviation

What proves it: Process qualification per special process with the parameter window, equipment qualification, personal certificates with expiry date, running parameter records or furnace charts per batch, an overview of requalification due dates. Where the process is bought in, the provider's qualification evidence applies.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.1.3 **Before serial release, a representative first article demonstrates that the planned production process, using the intended machines, tooling, programs and documents, meets every required characteristic. The first article inspection is documented in full and is repeated after significant changes to design, process, equipment, location or supplier, and after a long break in production.** Document Aviation

What proves it: First article inspection report comparing required against actual value characteristic by characteristic, reference to the drawing revision, the tool and program number, material certificates and special process reports, release note. The trigger for every repeat is recorded so the reasons stay traceable.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.2-a **Products and parts are uniquely identified throughout the whole flow, and the inspection status is visible at any moment, meaning whether an item is uninspected, released or on hold. The identification survives repackaging, splitting of batches and handover between areas.**

What proves it: Identification rule listing the means used, for example traveller card, label, tag or stamp, area layout showing marked quarantine zones, photographs or a walkthrough note from the internal audit as evidence that the practice is lived.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.2-b **Traceability is assured to the defined extent: a delivered part can be traced back to its material batch, production lot, the processes used and the associated inspection records, and in the other direction a batch can be traced forward to the assemblies and the customers it went to. The records needed for this are retained.** Document

What proves it: Batch or serial number scheme, traveller card with material certificate and lot number, delivery note carrying the batch reference, evidence of a traceability exercise run in both directions with date and elapsed time. A paper file per lot satisfies this as long as it is kept without gaps and can be found again.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.3 **Property belonging to customers or external providers while it is on your premises, such as supplied material, tooling, fixtures, measuring equipment, software, intellectual property and personal data, is identified, protected and verified for suitability. Loss, damage or unsuitability is reported to the owner and recorded.** Document

What proves it: Register of supplied property with owner, location and condition, incoming verification record for the supplied item, notification letter to the customer on damage with date and response. Drawings and data handed over by the customer belong in this register too.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.4 **Products are handled, packaged and preserved during manufacturing, storage and shipping so that their conformity is maintained. Shelf life limited or age sensitive materials are managed with an expiry date and consumed oldest stock first, and sensitive parts are protected against damage, contamination and electrostatic discharge.**

What proves it: Storage and packaging instructions, inventory list of shelf life limited materials with expiry date and quarantine rule, evidence of the storage conditions such as temperature or humidity records, marking of the areas for electrostatic discharge sensitive devices. For a small shop a shelf label with the expiry date plus a monthly visual check signed with date and initials is enough.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.5 **The extent of post-delivery activities is determined and follows risks, service life, customer requirements, statutory obligations and feedback from the field. Spare parts supply, repair, technical support and the collection and analysis of complaints and in-service events are governed by rules, and the findings feed back into design and manufacturing.**

What proves it: Contractual arrangement covering post-delivery services, spare parts register referencing the same build standard, field complaints with analysis and the actions derived from them, evidence of the feedback given to the customer. Reporting duties towards customer or authority are recorded together with their deadlines.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.5.6 **Changes to production and service provision, for instance to material, method, tooling, equipment, software, location or supplier, are evaluated and approved before they are implemented so that conformity is maintained. Where customer or authority approval is required, that approval is in hand before implementation. The evaluation, the approving person and the actions taken are recorded.** Document

What proves it: Change request with an assessment of the effect on product, process and the need for a new first article, approval signature with date, customer or authority approval in the file, reference to the documents updated as a result and to the repeated first article inspection.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.6 **A product is released to the customer only once all planned checks and evidence are present and satisfied. Early release happens only with the approval of an authorized function and, where required, of the customer. The release record demonstrates conformity and shows which authorized person released the item. Where an authority or customer certificate is required, it is shipped with the product.** Document

What proves it: Final inspection record with results against the inspection list, release stamp or signature of the authorized person, list of release authorized personnel showing the extent of each authorization, certificate of conformity or authority release certificate accompanying the delivery note. Every early release is recorded with the approver and the reason.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.7.1 **Nonconforming outputs are detected, identified and segregated so that they cannot be used or shipped unintentionally. An authorized person decides what happens to them, and the possible decisions are correction, rejection, containment, informing the customer or scrapping. Use as is or repair is permitted only with the approval of the authorized function and, where required, of the customer, and scrapped parts are rendered unusable. After a correction the item is inspected again.**

What proves it: Quarantine area or quarantine store with clear marking, hold tag on the item, decision record with name and date, customer concession in the file, evidence of scrapping, re-inspection record after rework. The circle of people authorized to decide is named explicitly.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

8.7.2 **For every nonconformity it is recorded what it consists of, what action was taken, whether a concession was granted and who decided. The records can be analysed so that repeating defect patterns become visible and feed into the corrective actions.** Document

What proves it: Defect report or nonconformity report per case with description, quantity, action, decision maker and date, a summary analysis by defect type and frequency, a link to the corrective actions started from it. A well-kept spreadsheet with one row per case is enough as long as analysis and linking remain possible.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9 Measuring, checking and evaluating performance 11

9.1.1-a **It is defined which parameters of the quality management system and of the processes are monitored and measured, by which methods this is done, at what points measurement takes place and when the results are analysed.**

What proves it: An overview of metrics with a definition for each one: data source, measurement method, measurement interval, owner, analysis date. A small company gets by with a single table holding one metric per row and the monthly value entered against it.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.1-b **The effectiveness and the performance of the quality management system are judged on the basis of these measurements, and the monitoring results are held as retained documented information.** Document

What proves it: Retained analyses such as monthly reports, metric sheets or printed dashboards carrying a date. The history matters: earlier versions stay traceable so that a trend becomes visible rather than only the current figure.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.2-a **The customers' perception of the degree to which their requirements have been met is monitored on an ongoing basis, and it is settled which sources this information comes from and how it is analysed.**

What proves it: Analyses drawn from customer surveys, the customer's own supplier ratings, scorecards from customer portals, complaint notifications, minutes of customer meetings. A company with only a few customers instead documents one short structured feedback conversation per customer per year.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.2-b **Customer satisfaction is captured not only through opinions but through hard performance data such as the defect rate of delivered product, on-time delivery, the number of complaints and of required corrective actions, and feedback on delivery disruptions, and improvement actions are derived from this data.**

What proves it: A set of metrics per customer: on-time delivery in percent, defect rate of delivered parts, number of customer complaints, number of corrective actions demanded, each with a target and an actual figure. Where the target is missed, a linked action entry. Where the customer supplies a scorecard, adopting it and adding an own action column is enough.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.1.3-a **The data collected is analysed and evaluated in order to arrive at statements on product conformity, customer satisfaction, process performance, the effectiveness of actions taken to address risks and opportunities, the performance of external providers, and the need for improvement of the system.**

What proves it: An analysis document that condenses raw data into statements, for example a quarterly quality report with trend lines and a written evaluation for each metric. What counts is the evaluating sentence, not the number on its own: what the trend means and whether it is acceptable.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.1-a **Internal audits take place at planned intervals and examine two things: whether the quality management system conforms to the organisation's own requirements and to the requirements of the standard, and whether it is in fact effectively implemented and maintained.**

What proves it: An annual audit schedule with dates, and audit reports that answer both questions separately. An audit that only cross-checks documents does not demonstrate effectiveness: the report should contain observations taken from production or from the workplace.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.2-a **An audit programme is established and, in setting frequency and audit scope, takes account of the importance of the processes concerned, changes in the operation, customer feedback and the results of previous audits, so that critical areas are audited more often than uncritical ones.** Document

What proves it: The audit programme as a multi-year or annual matrix, processes in the rows, months in the columns, with a short column giving the reason for the chosen frequency. It must be visible that a process with many complaints comes up more often.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.2-b **For every individual audit the objectives, criteria and scope are defined, the auditors are selected so that they do not audit their own area of work, and the results are reported to the relevant management.** Document

What proves it: An audit plan per date stating objective, criteria and scope, evidence of auditor competence and a declaration of independence, and the audit report with its distribution list. Small companies solve independence through a collegial swap between two areas or through an external auditor engaged by the hour.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.2.2-c **Findings are corrected without undue delay, the treatment of causes is tracked, and the effectiveness of the actions taken is verified before a finding is closed.**

What proves it: An action list attached to the audit report with owner, due date, status and a field for the effectiveness check including date and checker. A finding merely set to done, with nobody having countersigned the evidence, counts as open in the audit.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3.2-a **Top management reviews the quality management system at planned intervals and draws on a fixed set of inputs: the status of actions from the previous review, changes in the environment, customer satisfaction and feedback from interested parties, achievement of objectives, process performance and product conformity, nonconformities and corrective actions, audit results, the performance of external providers, the resource situation, the effectiveness of actions taken to address risks and opportunities, and opportunities for improvement.**

What proves it: A fixed agenda for the management review that adopts these points as its structure, plus the supporting inputs such as the metrics report, the audit summary, the complaints overview and the supplier evaluation. In small companies a half-day meeting once a year is enough, provided the agenda is worked through in full and minuted.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

9.3.3-a **The review produces decisions and actions relating to opportunities for improvement, to any needed changes to the system and to resource needs, and these results are retained as documented information.** Document

What proves it: Minutes of the management review with date, attendees, the inputs covered and a clearly separated decision section: for each decision the action, the owner, the due date and the resource commitment. The minutes are approved by top management and are called up again as a status item at the next meeting.

◯ Open ◯ In progress ◯ Met ◯ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10 Improvement: closing out nonconformities and advancing the system 5

10.1 **The organisation actively looks for opportunities to improve and implements the ones it selects, so that customer requirements are met more reliably, defects and their effects are reduced and the quality management system becomes more effective, covering products and services as well as the underlying processes.**

What proves it: An improvement log or action plan showing the trigger, the responsible person, the due date and the outcome, backed by examples drawn from customer feedback, scrap analysis or process indicators that show where each improvement originated. A small organisation keeps this as one maintained table into which complaints, internal defects and shop floor ideas all feed, so it stays visible what became of each of them.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2.1-a **When a nonconformity occurs, including one arising from a customer complaint, it is first contained and its consequences are dealt with, the affected product is secured, and it is then evaluated whether the cause needs to be eliminated so that the case does not recur or appear elsewhere. The root cause analysis explicitly considers the influence of human factors as well.**

What proves it: A defect report or complaint record with the immediate action taken, a hold notice for the affected parts and a traceable root cause analysis such as 5 Why or Ishikawa, in which working conditions, instruction, shift and time pressure were also examined. Small organisations use a single page form per case with the fields what happened, what was done immediately, why did it happen, what prevents recurrence, did it work.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2.1-b **The corrective actions decided upon are carried out on time, their effectiveness is verified afterwards, and the lesson learned is transferred to comparable processes, products and workstations. Where this creates a need, risks and opportunities, process descriptions and the management system itself are adjusted. If the cause lies with an external provider, the corrective action is required from that provider and its implementation is followed up.**

What proves it: Action tracking with planned and actual due date, an effectiveness check with date and acceptance criterion, for example no recurrence over a defined quantity or period, a note on the transfer to similar part families, plus the supplier notification with its reply and assessment. For a small organisation a column effectiveness verified on with initials in the same table is enough, together with a short mail to the supplier setting a deadline and the filed reply.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.2.2 **Documented information exists for every nonconformity and for the actions taken in response: the nature of the nonconformity, the actions taken and their result. This documented information can be retrieved, so that recurring patterns are recognised and can be evaluated in the internal audit and in the management review.** Document

What proves it: A running nonconformity and action register with a unique number per case, a reference to the order, part or process, the date, the responsible person, the status and the effectiveness result, together with the associated individual records. A maintained table with a filing reference is sufficient; what matters is that every case can be found again without searching through a mailbox.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification

10.3 **The organisation continually advances the suitability, adequacy and effectiveness of the quality management system and uses the results of analysis and evaluation as well as the conclusions of the management review to recognise where action is needed or where opportunities remain unused.**

What proves it: Minutes of the management review with the improvement decisions derived from it, a trend evaluation of key indicators across several periods, for example complaint rate, on time delivery or cost of scrap, plus a comparison of target and actual with the initiatives started from it. In a small organisation an annual overview with three to five indicators and the consequences drawn from them credibly demonstrates the ongoing development.

○ Open ○ In progress ○ Met ○ Not applicable

Evidence / justification